

NOV 26 103 pp. 3:47 1 2 3 4 Clark of the Superior Court 5 DEC 2 4 2003 6 By: C. NEPOMUCENO, Deputy 7 8 SUPERIOR COURT FOR THE STATE OF CALIFORNIA 9 **COUNTY OF SAN DIEGO** 10 By FAT THE CITIES OF ARCADIA, BALDWIN 11 Case No. GIC 803631 PARK, BELLFLOWER, CERRITOS. COMMERCE, DIAMOND BAR, DOWNEY. Judge Wayne L. Peterson IRWINDALE, LAWNDALE, MONROVIA, Department 75 MONTEBELLO, MONTEREY PARK, PICO 13 RIVERA, ROSEMEAD, SAN GABRIEL, SANTA FE SPRINGS, SIERRA MADRE, [Froposed] JUDGMENT SIGNAL HILL, SOUTH PASADENA, 15 VERNON, WEST COVINA and WHITTIER. municipal corporations, 16 Petitioners/Plaintiffs. 17 VS. 18 THE STATE WATER RESOURCES CONTROL BOARD; and THE CALIFORNIA REGIONAL WATER QUALITY CONTROL BOARD, LOS ANGELES REGION, and 20 DOES 1 through 50, inclusive, 21 Respondents/Defendants. 22 23 24 The Petition for Writ of Mandate came on for hearing and trial at 9:30 a.m. on November 25 5, 2003 in Department 75 of the above-entitled Court, the Honorable Wayne L. Peterson, presiding. Richard Montevideo and Terence Gallagher, Rutan & Tucker, LLP, appeared on behalf 26 27 of Plaintiffs and Petitioners the Cities of Arcadia, Baldwin Park, Bellflower, Cerritos, Commerce, 28 Diamond Bar, Downey, Irwindale, Lawndale, Monrovia, Montebello, Monterey Park, Pico Rivera, -1-

- [Troposed] JUDGMENT

624/065121-0067

454104.01 a11/26/03

| 1  | Rosemead, San Gabriel, Santa Fe Springs, Sierra Madre, Signal Hill, South Pasadena, Vernon,      |  |  |
|----|--|--|--|
| 2  | West Covina and Whittier ("Petitioners"). Gregory Newmark, Deputy Attorney General, Attorney     |  |  |
| 3  | General of the State of California, appeared on behalf of Respondents and Defendants State Water |  |  |
| 4  | Resources Control Board and California Regional Water Quality Control Board, Los Angeles         |  |  |
| 5  | Region.  |  |  |
| 6  | The Administrative Record, the judicially noticed materials, the pleadings, the briefs, and      |  |  |
| 7  | oral argument having been fully reviewed and considered by the Court, and the Court having       |  |  |
| 8  | issued its Statement of Decision on 12/24/03   |  |  |
| 9  | IT IS HEREBY ADJUDICATED, ORDERED, AND DECREED that:   |  |  |
| 10 | (1) Judgment is entered in favor of Petitioners and against Respondents on the Petition for      |  |  |
| 11 | Writ of Mandate.   |  |  |
| 12 | (2) Each of the following are void, invalid, and unenforceable: (1) the Trash Total              |  |  |
| 13 | Maximum Daily Loads for the Los Angeles River Watershed, dated September 19, 2001; (2) State     |  |  |
| 14 | Water Resources Control Board Resolution No. 2002-0038 adopted on February 19, 2002; (3)         |  |  |
| 15 | California Regional Water Quality Control Board, Los Angeles Region Resolution No. 01-013,       |  |  |
| 16 | adopted on September 19, 2001; (4) the Amendments to the Water Quality Control Plan - Los        |  |  |
| 17 | Angeles Region for the Los Angeles River Trash TMDL, as reflected in Attachment A to             |  |  |
| 18 | Resolution No. 01-013; (5) the Regulatory Action taken by the State of California Office of      |  |  |
| 19 | Administrative Law dated July 16, 2002, establishing "no trash" as the total maximum daily load  |  |  |
| 20 | of trash allowed to be discharged into the Los Angels River and adopting "a schedule for the     |  |  |
| 21 | progressive attainment of this standard over a period of about twelve years;" and (6) California |  |  |
| 22 | Regional Water Quality Control Board, Los Angeles Region Memorandum dated July 29, 2002          |  |  |
| 23 | regarding the Los Angeles River Watershed and Ballona Creek Trash TMDLs. The regulatory          |  |  |
| 24 | actions described in numbers (1)-(6) above regarding the adoption of Trash Total Maximum Daily   |  |  |
| 25 | Loads for the Los Angeles River Watershed shall be referred to collectively as the "Los Angeles  |  |  |
| 26 | River Trash TMDLs."  |  |  |
| 27 | (3) A Peremptory Writ of Mandate be issued under the seal of this Court commanding the           |  |  |

Ruten & Tuoker LLP actorneys at Jaw

-2-

28 State Water Resources Control Board and California Water Resources Control Board, Los

| į  | l l   |   |  |
|----|---|---|--|
| 1  | Angeles Region and all officers, officials, agents, attorneys, employees and persons and entities |   |  |
| 2  | acting on behalf of, or through color of the authority of State Water Resources Control Board and |   |  |
| 3  | California Water Resources Control Board, Los Angeles Region, to set aside the Los Angeles        |   |  |
| 4  | River Trash TMDLs, and not to take any other or further steps to implement, enforce or apply the  |   |  |
| 5  | Los Angeles River Trash TMDLs.  |   |  |
| 6  | (4) Petitioners shall be awarded costs in the amount of \$\frac{10 be \( \)}{2}                   |   |  |
| 7  | (5) That this Court reserve general jurisdiction herein.  |   |  |
| 8  | Dated: DEC 2 4 2003   | WAYNE L. PETERSON   |  |
| 9  | Dated. BLO "  | Hon. Wayne L. Peterson Judge of the Supreme Court of California |  |
| 10 |   | Judge of the Supreme Court of Camorina                          |  |
| 11 |   |   |  |
| 12 | SUBMITTED BY:   |   |  |
| 13 | RUTAN & TUCKER, LLP   |   |  |
| 14 | By: Richard Montevideo  |   |  |
| 15 | Attorney for Plaintiffs/Petitioners   |   |  |
| 16 |   |   |  |
| 17 |   |   |  |
| 18 |   |   |  |
| 19 |   |   |  |
| 20 |   |   |  |
| 21 |   |   |  |
| 22 |   |   |  |
| 23 |   |   |  |
| 24 |   |   |  |
| 25 |   |   |  |
| 26 |   |   |  |
| 27 |   |   |  |
| 28 |   |   |  |

Rutus & Tustos LLP attorneys at Jaw

> 624/065121-0067 454104.01 a11/26/03

-3-

(Proposed) JUDGMENT

## 1 2 PROOF OF SERVICE BY MAIL 3 STATE OF CALIFORNIA, COUNTY OF ORANGE 4 5 I am employed by the law office of Rutan & Tucker, LLP in the County of Orange, State of California. I am over the age of 18 and not a party to the within action. My business address is 6 611 Anton Boulevard, Fourteenth Floor, Costa Mesa, California 92626-1931. 7 On November 26, 2003, I served on the interested parties in said action the within: 8 [Proposed] JUDGMENT 9 by placing a true copy thereof in sealed envelope(s) addressed as stated below: 10 Bill Lockyer 11 Attorney General Gregory Newmark, Esq. 12 Deputy Attorney General California Attorney General Office 13 300 South Spring Street, Suite 1100N Los Angeles, CA 90013 14 In the course of my employment with Rutan & Tucker, LLP, I have, through first-hand 15 personal observation, become readily familiar with Rutan & Tucker, LLP's practice of collection and processing correspondence for mailing with the United States Postal Service. Under that 16 practice, I deposited such envelope(s) in an out-box for collection by other personnel of Rutan & Tucker, LLP, and for ultimate posting and placement with the U.S. Postal Service on that same day 17 **[** in the ordinary course of business. If the customary business practices of Rutan & Tucker, LLP with regard to collection and processing of correspondence and mailing were followed, and I am confident that they were, such envelope(s) were posted and placed in the United States mail at Costa Mesa, California, that same date. I am aware that on motion of party served, service is presumed invalid if postal cancellation date or postage meter date is more than one day after date of deposit for mailing in affidavit. 20 Executed on November 26, 2003, at Costa Mesa, California. 21 I declare under penalty of perjury under the laws of the State of California that the 22 foregoing is true and correct. 23 Karen M. Hardy 24 (Type or print name) 25 26 27

[Proposed] JUDGMENT

28

624/065121-0067

454104.01 a11/26/03